



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

RECENT TENNESSEE HISTORY BY TEN- NESSEANS. ¹

The circumstance that the present year is that of the Centennial of Tennessee has naturally called forth a good deal of oratory and much newspaper and essay writing in comment thereon. Some of this will, no doubt, be collected and edited, even if it must be admitted that too often in such efforts there is a sublime tendency towards constellations of rhetoric and to "scraping the feet of the angels," as a recent graduating speech described the well-known process. The few historical facts usually stated are gathered from histories already existing on the subject, whose inaccuracies, and possibly gross blunders are unhesitatingly accepted and assiduously followed. All this may possibly add to our patriotism, and some growing lad or lass may be induced to acquire some knowledge of what the State has actually achieved, what annals are worth preserving and what records ought to be perpetuated as a heritage to succeeding generations. And, perhaps, here and there, it may be hoped, some one of these may be stimulated to actual investigation, and research for one's self may clear up hitherto obscure passages, preserve scattered material from quick and

¹ *Studies in the Constitutional History of Tennessee.* By Joshua W. Caldwell. Cincinnati: The Robert Clark Company, 1895. pp. xiv., 183.

Blount College and the University of Tennessee. An Historical Address delivered before the Alumni Association and Members of the University of Tennessee, June 12, 1894. By Edward T. Sanford, A. M. Published by the University, [Knoxville, 1895]. pp. 119.

Higher Education in Tennessee. By Lucius Salisbury Merriam, Ph.D. Bureau of Education Circular of Information No. 5. 1893. [Contributions to American Educational History, edited by Herbert B. Adams.] Washington, Government Printing Office, 1893. pp. 287.

Annual Reports of the State Superintendent of Education. Nashville, 1893, 1894, 1895.

The American Historical Magazine. Edited by W. R. Garrett, Vol. 1, No. 1. 1896.

irreparable loss, form new conclusions, and present broader, and more real and vital phases of our life and civilization.

Even the essays and speeches of graduating students this year adopted this color. The spirit of the centennial of their college celebrated two years ago, and that of their State coincident with their entrance upon life, fell upon the graduating class of the State University, and in the only three speeches made by their representatives on their Commencement Day, this spirit of the time found clear and noble utterance in words which would have done credit to much older heads and have done honor to any Tennessean to utter. The three subjects, self-chosen, were respectively, "A Plea for State Pride," "Tennessee's Part in the Union before 1860," and the "Advocacy of a closer Union between the Divisions of the State."

The sense, therefore, of Tennessee's one hundred years of existence and development has not lain altogether dormant with many of her citizens. They understand the reproach of carelessness that they have incurred for not preserving in State archives the best and worthiest records of their race. There has been noticeable, for a few years back, an increased interest in matters Tennessean — in the beginnings, the conditions, the characteristics, and the essential qualities, of her people.

There is no question that Mr. Theodore Roosevelt has given a stimulus and contributed largely to this result by the inestimable worth of the labors stored up in his volumes on "The Winning of the West," of which the fourth volume has recently appeared. It was left to Mr. Roosevelt nobly to remove the reproach left by another non-Tennessean in dealing with Tennessee history in the books of "Edmund Kirke," which bravely yielded the imagination to more congenial romance without the painful labor always involved in consulting original documents and in ascertaining actual facts.

Before Mr. Roosevelt's book appeared, the work of the late lamented Congressman, James Phelan, of Memphis,

lent the main inspiration. Phelan had returned from the University of Leipsic, skilled in the principles of investigation and ardent for the genuine literary and historical work of his State and country. His labors upon his "History of Tennessee" — involving much time and expense in gaining access to material almost hopelessly scattered — were given to his State freely, and without any hope of pecuniary reward. One of his latest and most memorable acts was to use all his influence as a member of the Federal House of Representatives in achieving the incorporation by the National Government of the American Historical Association.

Mr. Roosevelt's purpose took wider and fuller scope than any work hitherto treating of Tennessee history, and he had at his command new unedited manuscript material lent him by authorities and individuals in Nashville, and in capital cities of other States. For the first time was clearly presented the full significance of the settlement of the great basin of the Mississippi and the part Tennesseans took therein. It was seen how the settlements of Tennessee fitted into the movement for the conquest of a nation; how the bravery and self-reliance of these pioneers, as the vanguard of civilization, meant that the home of the English race in America was not to be limited to the thirteen colonies and the contiguous land, all east of the Alleghany mountains. These mountains once crossed, the Eastern Tennessee valleys filled from above and below, Cumberland Gap made a means of passage to lands beyond, the claims of the sovereigns of Spain and of France to one of the fairest countries on earth were destined to recede before the advances of the axe and rifle of the hardy Saxon pioneer. And it was the English law and the English language and literature and religion and habits of thought and principles of action which passed on with the pioneer — modified possibly and naturally by the new circumstances to which it had to become adapted, but that was all. At last a new American spirit was formed, faulty perhaps, in much, but American to the core, native of America, nourished un-

der American government, and developed under American conditions. This was the inspiration of the message of Mr. Roosevelt's volumes to Tennessee students!

This is likewise the spirit underlying the conception of the volume by Mr. J. W. Caldwell on the constitutional development of Tennessee. Not that Mr. Roosevelt's volumes were needed to interest him primarily. The interest was there already — deep laid by years of reading and investigation. But the spark was fanned, as it were, into a sudden blaze, and the gradual accumulations were at length ordered and shaped in emulation of the spirit pervading Mr. Roosevelt's work. Not all Tennessee history should await record by non-Tennesseans, and particularly that which possibly only one native and to the manor born could best and most truly interpret.

"Did I have the time and leisure from the imperative demands of the duties of my life," said Mr. Caldwell once in effect, feelingly, and apart from all reference to Mr. Roosevelt's work, "the history of the formative period in Tennessee, and particularly that of East Tennessee, should be finally written!" "Not finally," replied his close friend and warm admirer, Mr. Sanford, playing upon the word, "for after you had finished yours, I should then add mine." Enough honest difference of opinion, or rather, enough different points of view exist for interests most varied. And may both these gentlemen find the *otium cum dignitate*, or better, the relaxation amidst other pressing professional and business pursuits to gather and sift and give that remnant of results which will prove the noblest monument to their native State and section, and to themselves and their interests and culture.

At least the beginning has been made in the case of each, and with each in his individual way. Mr. Caldwell has given us a series of chapters on the constitutional history of Tennessee, which, as all who know the man and his zeal and thoroughness believe, excellent as they are, are but the introductory announcement to a large treatise to follow.

“The origin and operation of the forces which have shaped the social and political life of Tennessee,” and the “distinct unique, and important constitutional history,” of this State have been mapped out with such force and clearness by the author, that the expectation is irresistible that many suggestions and details, only to be hinted at in so brief and succinct a treatment as the present, will be developed and discussed in fulness by one who has proved himself the “competent historian.” Mr. Sanford made use of an invitation to deliver the Commencement Address at his *alma mater* on the occasion of her centennial celebration, to investigate afresh and impartially the history of State aid to education in Tennessee. What had been hitherto mere generalized statement or had been left wholly unnoticed in previous publications was closely examined. No document, no legislative enactment, no bill of Congress, no compromise, or practical working detail under any law, but was carefully reviewed, every matter traced even to the slightest variance and inaccuracy, and where inaccuracies still remained, the real status of all accessible facts in the case was for the first time subjected to light and submitted to judgment.

It is worthy of remark, then, to find two such conscientious pieces of work, the result of patient and toilsome investigation emanating from the same source at the same time. And I am not now speaking of the average eloquent dissertation that takes down its Parton, and its Haywood, and its Ramsey, or some new international cyclopædia, and accepts gratuitously facts and dates, and forthwith proceeds to manufacture the thunder and lightning which is the popular adornment of the gods in this world, as well as in any other. Again, it is not my purpose to enter upon the circumstantial details of these and the other books here noted. I wish to trace the movement of which these gentlemen are, as it seems to me, the chief exponents, and to note the methods they are adopting and the influences by which they are affected. It need not excite surprise that much of

this work comes from that part of the State where the first settlements were made and where the first governments were formulated and organized. To live where the first territorial government was held would itself incite a student of law and institutions, to reside hardly a stone's throw from the graves and monuments of John Sevier and William Blount would invite an examination of their characters and their motives and those of the times. To be graduated from an institution, first founded with a degree of State recognition and State approval, named in honor of the governor of the territory with its seat of government at the time in Knoxville, possessing on its first Board of Trust most of the prominent names of the State soon to be formed, and destined to develop with unbroken historic continuity into the State University of to-day — this would naturally bring the reflecting student of historical evolution and of the play of past forces, to trace that development and that past step by step, and to examine into State relations and State policy, whether always consistent and worthy of that State or not. Surely such work as this is the duty and privilege of the sons of that Commonwealth, that upon the threshold of a second century they may look back and study the characteristic features, the sources of strength and of weakness, of her past century's history and progress.

The work of Hannis Taylor, Esq., of Mobile, the present minister to Spain, declared the growth of American directly out of English constitutional principles and helped to crystallize into a definite conception ideas on constitutional growth within the boundaries of a single State. Admitting such premises as proved, the other process of development within a State, settled under peculiar circumstances, susceptible to peculiar conditions, and possessing "a distinct, unique, and important constitutional history," constitutes the subject that Mr. Caldwell has treated in the present volume.

The origins of the early settlements, the character of

the people forming them, and the first union or government entered into by these settlers, or forced upon them by outward circumstances—the Watauga Association from 1772 to 1777—is the subject of the first chapter. It is in the portrayal of these earliest conditions, under the Watauga, Cumberland, and Franklin unions, that the peculiar interest and strength of the book lies. The changes wrought under later constitutions were changes in detail produced naturally by changed aspects and phases and conditions, but based upon fundamental principles perfectly fixed and already well established.

Mr. Caldwell emphasizes in his opening chapter as in his perface, the importance of the Scotch-Irish element in early Tennessee history, an importance which many believe to be overestimated. I believe the author is right, and I do not believe that he is affected by distinct personal, even if unconscious predilection for that strong and virile race of which he himself is a marked and worthy representative. There were other names than Scotch-Irish ones individually no doubt, but the settlement, beyond the mountains in Tennessee and Kentucky, was essentially a movement of the genius of that race, and was marked by their leadership in religion, in law, and in education. This point of the beginnings and the question as to the race elements involved are worthy of finding a special chapter of their own in the more extended form of his book which I am advised the author is contemplating.

It is too common in after-dinner speeches upon festal celebrations to hear each race element in America accredited with framing the government, saving the Union, and conferring upon us national greatness and honor, and so forth. After heavy eating, even without heavy drinking, the expansive white vest heaves, and one is prepared to hear that it was the Puritans, or the Hollanders, or the French Huguenots, or the Scotch-Irish, or what not, who did it all. One sometimes wonders according to these speeches, whether there was any simply English blood or

English tradition at all, even at any moment, on American soil ; or whether all these conflicting views are not true at the same time, and whether all the different race elements did not help "do it all." But to return from an aside.

The history of the Scotch-Irish in the upland districts of the Middle and Southern States, in the Piedmont sections east and west of the Appalachian range, is that of one of the mighty race movements in American history. How in the middle of the eighteenth century the Valley of Virginia was opened to them by the Burden Grant in what is now Augusta and Rockbridge counties ; how they served long as outposts against the western Indians to the eastern-lying English settlements ; how they both formulated for their government freedom in religion from any recognized State church, and developed remarkable democracy in law ; how the first settlers were reënforced by others of the same stock from Pennsylvania crossing the Potomac and proceeding southward up the Shenandoah — all this is but a small part of the interesting story. This movement had its origin in the settlements of the Scotch-Irish along the Delaware Bay and River, in northern Delaware, (Newcastle county), in southeastern Pennsylvania (Chester, York, and Lancaster counties), and in western and central New Jersey. They proceeded westward through central and southern Pennsylvania, when large numbers turned southward and filled the rich Valley of Virginia, while others pushed still farther westward to western Pennsylvania, and thence ultimately across the Ohio into the Northwest Territory. From the Valley of Virginia (Augusta and Rockbridge counties serving as a nucleus) they discharged themselves through the hills of southern and southwest Virginia, and thence over the uplands of both Carolinas, on to Georgia. Passing in another way to the southwest, they crossed the Virginia mountains, moved down the Holston river, and crossing where they could, through gaps, entered upon the untrodden soil of Tennessee and Kentucky, in their march onward to the southwestern and western lands, preferably following

the courses of rivers, and keeping with singular pertinacity to the hill and mountain districts.

The writer of this paper has had in his hands the original documents of the old Hanover Presbytery — most accessible in Foote's "Sketches of Virginia," both series, and in the "Sketches of North Carolina" — the Presbytery which was formed in 1749, as the first south of Mason and Dixon's line. It embraced all of Virginia, both Carolinas indefinitely, and the settlements in Kentucky and Tennessee (Nolichucky is more than once mentioned), and this indicates the extent of country that the Scotch-Irish migrations, and the Presbyterian congregations at that time covered. The handful of ministers, a dozen or so, called upon to supply religious needs in this vast territory, were as really itinerant as the later Methodist circuit riders who grew out of the same conditions. Thus circumstances controlled destinies. The first Presbytery to be cut off from the Hanover after the Orange in North Carolina, was the Abingdon (in 1785) which included, much like the present Methodist Holston Conference, all southwest Virginia and the contiguous parts of Tennessee, with probably a large portion of Kentucky. It was very natural, therefore, that when the boundary line between Virginia and North Carolina was run, many of these settlers, Virginians in origin, finding to their dismay that they were no longer on Virginia soil and subject to Virginia law, should assist in the foundation of the Watauga Association, designed for their common protection and defense, and that with the full sympathies of many associates and friends in the western parts of Virginia, they should later enter into the compact of the "State of Franklin," and propose therefor a written constitution based upon many calvinistic principles, believed by them to be so necessary a part of their life.

The essential Anglo-Saxon features of the Watauga Association are indisputable. They were very much the same principles found among Scotch-Irish in the western portions of Virginia and the Carolinas, but here developed

and applied under new and slightly changed conditions. Only in Virginia and North Carolina these principles became incorporated with others already existing in the eastern and older parts of those States; in Tennessee they were favorably forced by circumstances into a more completely independent development. The early settlements in the Valley of Virginia existed for a long time apart by themselves and cut off from the rest of the State and the world and in their origin were very much like this later commonwealth beyond the Alleghanies in Eastern Tennessee. There will be found many of the same essential features in each which would reward examination in closer detail. This is a connecting link which I have not found explicitly stated, and it has occurred to me that it would give added strength to many of the positions taken.

The interest of these Scotch-Irish in free government lay close to their views of non-interference by the State in matters of religion and of thought. True, their ideas as to freedom of religion may have meant primarily freedom from interference on the part of the Church of England, and the possibility of the introduction and toleration of Roman Catholics among their Protestant homes probably never entered their heads. Mr. Caldwell strikingly points out the contradictions unconsciously involved. In the proposed *Frankland* constitution (to distinguish it from that actually adopted by the State of *Franklin*), "a citizen might have held what opinion he pleased, but he would not have been eligible to office unless his beliefs had conformed to the dogmas of the [Presbyterian] Church." Yet he believes, too, that the principle of freedom was there and was clearly announced, even if it did not always receive that special application.

Ardor for education was the handmaid of the zeal of these people in religious matters. The preacher of Sunday became the schoolmaster of the week days, and started almost invariably an academy, in which instruction in the ancient classics was strenuously emphasized. The indebted-

ness of early education in Tennessee to the Scotch-Irish is touched upon by all three of our authors, Mr. Caldwell, Mr. Sanford, and Dr. Merriam and the indebtedness to Princeton and the Scotch-Irish schools and clergy is acknowledged; but as the subject is treated only with reference to Tennessee, in an isolated manner and not as a part of the same great race movement already outlined above, I venture to indicate some details to show both the extent and the intensity of these influences.

The early educational movement in East and Middle Tennessee is a part of a greater movement and is co-extensive with the migrations of the Scotch-Irish people, in their march from the Delaware to the West and Southwest. From the original "log-colleges" in Pennsylvania as feeders grew Princeton, the institution above all, to which the pupils of the "log college," and the academy were sent to obtain their titled degrees. It is interesting that it remains the oldest, and still easily the most prominent of all in the movement. These Princeton men went forth and fashioned other academies and colleges after the same models, these in turn becoming new centres of influence. The "log colleges" had sent out Samuel Davies, the "apostle," of the Presbyterian Church in Virginia, James Waddell, the Blind Preacher of Virginia, and the Blairs, the Smiths, and the Tennents of Pennsylvania. John Brown, a Princeton graduate, progenitor of the statesmen and ministers of that name in Virginia, Kentucky, Louisiana, and other parts of the South, founded an academy in the Valley of Virginia, which William Graham, another Princeton graduate, made famous as "Liberty Hall," and which has developed into the present Washington and Lee University. It was at "Liberty Hall" that General Samuel Blackburn, Judge David Campbell, General William Campbell, of King's Mountain, the Rev. Samuel Carrick, founder of Blount College; the Rev. Edward Crawford, the Rev. Samuel Doak, founder of Washington College; Robert Edmiston, a King's Mountain hero; the Rev. Samuel Houston; Col. John Mc-

Kee, a member of Congress; Samuel Newell, a King's Mountain hero and member of the Franklin Convention; James Priestley, President of the old Cumberland College at Nashville; and Governor Archibald Roane — all prominent figures in early Tennessee history received their educations. The Revs. Edward Crawford and Samuel Doak were also graduates of Princeton.

Two brothers, and Princeton graduates, the Rev. Samuel Stanhope Smith and the Rev. John Blair Smith, went to the Davies' settlement in southern Virginia, and founded Hampden-Sidney College, where later the Presbyterian Theological Seminary developed. The one returned later to Princeton and became its President, and the other was the first President of Union College, New York. Associated with them at Hampden-Sidney was the Rev. Samuel Doak, who from here entered the ministry, and in a few years crossed the mountains with his library and goods on pack-horses; founded in Tennessee the first institution of learning west of the Alleghanies, and left to that State a family which has contributed many honorable names to her education and culture.

Another Princeton graduate teaching at Hampden-Sidney was the Rev. John Springer, one of the earliest evangelists in religion and education in upper North Carolina and Georgia. Still another Hampden-Sidney tutor, the Rev. James Mitchel, was one of the earliest teachers of a classical school in Kentucky. Associated in founding Hampden-Sidney College were other Princeton graduates, — the Revs. John Todd, David Rice, and Caleb Wallace — all three foremost in the struggle in Virginia for religious liberty, and all afterwards instrumental in establishing the same principles and in founding the first college in pioneer Kentucky. It was no doubt owing to association with these men in college life at Princeton, in political life in Virginia, and for many years as fellow trustee of Hampden-Sidney College, that James Madison, afterwards President of the United States, in his early career worked as assiduously for religious liberty as

for political independence. Two of the Hampden-Sidney graduates, both North Carolinians by birth, ought to be associated prominently with this movement: the Rev. James Blythe, going west, became associated with the Rev. David Rice in collecting funds for Transylvania University in Kentucky, and after teaching therein a number of years, furthered education in the Northwest as President of Hanover College in Indiana; the Rev. Moses Waddel, going south, was the preceptor of many of the most eminent citizens of South Carolina and Georgia, both in a private school and at the University of Georgia. Other Princeton graduates, such as the Rev. Daniel McCalla and "Parson" John D. Blair, were active in education in central Virginia.

The Princeton graduates in North Carolina achieved similar results. The first bloodshed of the Revolution on the Alamance was the result of a conflict between Governor Tryon's troops and the "Regulators", and these "Regulators" were members of three Presbyterian congregations who had as their pastors three graduates of Princeton — the Revs. Hugh McAden, David Caldwell, and Joseph Alexander. The Rev. Joseph Alexander founded the first institution of learning in that State, before passing on to similar work in South Carolina. His school in Mecklenburg county became a second "Liberty Hall", thirteen of its fifteen trustees being Princeton men, and in this building was the meeting whence issued the noted Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence, reputed to have been inspired and written by two Princeton graduates, Ephraim Brevard, and the Rev. Hezekiah Balch, the latter presumably a cousin of the Rev. Hezekiah Balch (his classmate at Princeton) noted in Tennessee annals.

The Rev. David Caldwell, who had suffered during the Revolution from the Alamance incident and from his intense patriotism, was one of the leaders in organizing the institution of learning in Orange county at Chapel Hill to become the State University, and was proffered its first Presidency, which, however, he declined. The "First Professor" at its organization was another Princeton graduate, the Rev.

Samuel E. McCorkle. Another of the Caldwell family, also a graduate of Princeton, the Rev. Joseph Caldwell, saved this college from a state of disorganization, almost at its beginning, and as President through many years laid the foundations for its future usefulness. In an interim of a few years, another Princeton graduate, the Rev. Robert Hett Chapman, took the Rev. Joseph Caldwell's place. Governors Alexander Martin, William R. Davie, and David Stone, and Judges Samuel Spencer, William Gaston, and Frederick Nash, are prominent North Carolinians in civic life who came under these influences and graduated from Princeton before 1800. One of the earliest educational institutions in the State of South Carolina was Mt. Zion College at Winsboro' under the Rev. Thomas H. McCaule, of Princeton.

The movement for civil and religious freedom and for the extension of education went hand in hand, and among these people was much the same on the western as on the eastern side of the mountains—in Tennessee as in North Carolina—though there were inherent difficulties in their new conditions—not a few of which sprang from their virtually absolute geographical and physical separation from the other members of their race. Several of the leaders in Kentucky and Tennessee have already been named. Besides Mr. Doak and Mr. Crawford, Princeton graduates active in Tennessee education were the Rev. Thomas B. Craighead, founder of Davidson Academy in Middle Tennessee, that later developed into the University of Nashville, and the Rev. Hezekiah Balch, founder of Greenville College, and prominent in the annals of the Franklin conventions. At a later period, succeeding the Rev. James Priestley in Nashville, and the one who gave to the University of Nashville its brightest administration, was the Rev. Philip Lindsley, likewise from Princeton. A lay representative of the race among the early graduates of Princeton, who was prominent in Tennessee, was the Hon. George W. Campbell, member of Congress, United States Judge, and Secretary of the Treasury under President Madison.

The scantiest reference must suffice for the similar labors of the leaders of this race moving westward and northward. They united in founding and strengthening the University of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia. Into the wilds of western Pennsylvania Presbyterianism was first carried by the Revs. Joseph Smith, James Power, Thaddeus Dod, John McMillan, and James Dunlap, all Princeton graduates; and in order, Dickinson, Washington, and Jefferson Colleges were established. Of the latter two, originally separate, Washington is intimately associated with the name of Dod, and Jefferson with McMillan and Dunlap. Across the Ohio, the University of Ohio at Athens was the product of similar circumstances, and its first President, the Rev. Jacob Lindly, was from Princeton. Miami University had much the same history some years later. Union and Hamilton Colleges in New York felt the same influences, and the same movement can even be traced to New England in the early history of Dartmouth and Brown.

I have entered upon this long list, which is somewhat of a catalogue, with a purpose—that the import and extent of the influences of this racial and religious and educational movement may be better understood. After tracing this, just as in marking the controlling thread in a woof, the character and spirit of the men of early Tennessee, and of the State of Franklin, can be better understood, as well as the scope and inspiration of the rejected semi-theological Frankland Constitution. Thus, too, Mr. Sanford's discussion of the early history of Blount College and Dr. Merriam's monograph on the beginnings of education in the State and the further educational developments, form an admirable parallel to Mr. Caldwell's study of character and institutions as displayed in the various constitutional phases.

The dominant characteristics of these people Mr. Caldwell finds in the Tennessee of to-day, thus differentiated from Kentucky and other Southern States, where a few powerful families succeeded in forming an aristocracy. "Here the descendants of the pioneers, or of the same class

to which they belonged, are still dominant" (p. 15). The thorough and essential democracy of Tennessee and Tennesseans—a new product, but distinctly *American* in its tendencies—has been recognized as a part of American national life ever since the advent of Andrew Jackson, perhaps its most characteristic representative. In speaking of the Watauga Association, the difference between the efforts in the seventeenth century and those in Tennessee in the eighteenth, Mr. Caldwell argues, is that there, those were Englishmen forging the organic law of an independent republic, but here, for the first time, these were *Americans* establishing absolutely free and democratic institutions. Further, these were not the original rebels; the "motive of the Association was not opposition to any authority, but the desire to create an authority" (p. 30). It is in tracing this continuity in the institutions and in the people of Tennessee that Mr. Caldwell's book calls forth sustained attention and ranks as a distinct contribution.

As has been intimated, the chapter on the Watauga Association and that on the State of Franklin form the most fascinating pages in Tennessee's early history. The Cumberland Constitution of 1780 is naturally interesting to Middle Tennessee, but its chief historical interest rests in the belief that in it we have not only the same conditions and purposes, but the essential features of the Watauga settlement and union, even if not for the most part the same language. The episode of the State of Franklin will ever attract the imagination of the State's historians—its position was so unique and its history so romantic. Mr. Caldwell expresses himself as thoroughly convinced that in its inception the Franklin movement was justifiable; a government was a necessity for these people, and they accordingly proceeded to make one. He does not believe that "there was the slightest possibility of carrying them over to any foreign power. . . . Franklin did not separate from North Carolina, but established a government to protect herself because she thought it necessary. If some of the people adhered to the

movement after it had ceased even to appear to be necessary, their number constantly decreased until the reunion was complete."

The calvinistic spirit of the rejected Constitution of Frankland is easily comprehended after one has studied the character of the people and their leaders in the Presbyterian ministry, and its relation to the Presbyterian form of church government, constantly praised by its sympathizers as the most democratic in spirit of all existing forms. It would be interesting and not without value to investigate the origin of many of the added empirical features of this document, whence obtained and by what channels, and its relations to other charters and declarations promulgated under similar circumstances. These clergymen in the Southwest kept constantly in touch and correspondence with their brethren to the north and east; and the number of pupils and disciples of William Graham, the Principal of "Liberty Hall" Academy in Virginia, present in the bounds of the State of Franklin at this time, has been already emphasized. The authorship of this rejected constitution has been much disputed, and this is my excuse for calling attention to the above circumstances and to certain traditions and authorities extant which may throw added light on the document. Mr. Caldwell follows Ramsey in attributing it to the Rev. Samuel Houston "with the advice and assistance of some judicious friends." The Rev. Samuel Houston was a pupil of William Graham's, and was one of twelve to be awarded the Bachelor's degree (in 1785, say the records) the first instance of degrees given by the college under the privilege of its charter granted by the Virginia legislature in 1782. The Revs. Samuel Carrick and James Priestley were likewise among the twelve. The Rev. Samuel Doak, who sat in the Franklin Convention, as did the Rev. Samuel Houston, was also a former pupil of Graham's.

Now, it is interesting that tradition has always associated the name of William Graham, President of this college, with the Frankland Constitution. He was peculiarly

active in the struggle for independence in the War of the Revolution, and later in the prolonged contest in Virginia for religious liberty was one of the leaders in the Presbyterian party. He was peculiarly interested in the settlement and development of the West (Kentucky and Tennessee), and invested largely and unfortunately in lands on the Ohio. Mr. Hugh Blair Grigsby, in his historical address on the Founders of Washington College, delivered in 1870, thought Graham did not hesitate to assist his friends and neighbors in preparing a plan of government, referring to John Sevier and Judge David Campbell as former Valley (of Virginia) boys, and to Landon Carter as a fellow Virginian from the Tidewater. Mr. Grigsby probably went too far in his inferences, and perhaps followed tradition too readily when he stated that, "Graham was requested to draught a form of government, and he prepared a paper for the purpose." [*Wash. and Lee Hist. Papers*, No. 2, p. 24]. For the rest, as justification of the movement, he took very nearly the same view that Mr. Caldwell does: "To carve a new State out of the territory of a State without the authority of law would be a grave and unjustifiable procedure in our own times. But in the case of Sevier and his associates it was substantially a work of self-defense. They were separated by hundreds of miles from the settlements; they were surrounded by savages who awaited a favorable moment of attack; they were beyond the protection of the laws. They had not a dollar in coin to pay taxes. And when the new government was established, its officers were paid mainly in the skins of wild beasts — the governor and the judges in fox skins, the sheriff in those of the mink, and other officers in those of coons and opossums; and though this gradation is not strictly correct, it is unquestionable that skins, domestic cloth, bacon, tallow, and whiskey, according to a rate fixed by law, composed the main currency of the infant commonwealth." [*Ibid.*, pp. 24, 25].

The probability is that the Rev. Samuel Houston, who still felt very close to his *alma mater*, and others, consulted

with William Graham, as the educational and liberal leader in western Virginia, about the proposed constitution. The Rev. Henry Ruffner, D.D., in his *Early History of Washington College* (pp. 60, 61), adopted this view, which is the most reasonable. "A committee was appointed to draft the form of a constitution for the projected State. There is a report that Mr. Graham was, by request of the committee, the draftsman, but this is not probable; for after the proposed constitution was published, he wrote and published a pamphlet in which he speaks of this constitution as the production of the committee and not of his own pen, and praised it far too highly to comport with the modesty of an author when speaking of his own work. Either this laudatory pamphlet or the constitution so lauded—probably the former—was violently assailed by the Rev. Hezekiah Balch, a member of the Abingdon Presbytery, which was mostly within the projected State. Mr. Graham in turn addressed a printed letter to Balch, in which he satirized him most bitterly. The Synod, before whom the case was brought, inflicted but a light censure on Graham, because the provocation was considered more than a man of Graham's irascible temperament could well bear. But the people who opposed the project of a new State did not let him off so easily. His defense of the scheme so irritated some of them that they assembled tumultuously and burnt him in effigy." Balch seems not to have been on the most sympathetic terms with the "Liberty Hall" coterie in his Presbytery, and these contentions sound like the echoes and reverberations of a Synod quarrel, carried on with all the conscientiousness of the participants.

As to Graham's views of an ideal constitution for a State, Dr. Ruffner proceeds (p. 63): "In this pamphlet Mr. Graham showed himself to be thoroughly democratic in his political sentiments. But he had some notions on government which the sad experience of the world has demonstrated to be visionary. He imagined that by constitutional provision the vicious part of society might be excluded from political

power, and only the virtuous suffered to bear rule. He was in favor of agrarian law, to prohibit any individual from owning a large quantity of land. He was for frequent rotation in all public offices; for appointing judicial as well as other officers by popular elections; for a single legislative body; and for submitting every bill to the consideration of the people during six months, before it should become a law." This last is curiously enough like the Swiss *referendum*, and Mr. Graham's views are also closely allied to those of the rejected Frankland document. An example of the extreme language used in his pamphlets is offered by Dr. Ruffner: "The report of the committee [who drew up the plan of a Constitution for Frankland] contains an article which excludes from all civil offices immoral men, such as habitual drunkards, profane swearers, gamesters, lewd persons, etc.,—one of the wisest and best articles in the universe, and with other articles of that report, will do honor to the gentlemen who framed it, as long as the English language is understood, whether the people of Frankland be wise enough to adopt them or not."

The circumstances attendant upon the rejection of this constitution and the importance of the measures involved justify all the space and criticism that Mr. Caldwell has given to its provisions. In this chapter are some of the most acute observations in his book.

The romantic period of Tennessee constitution-making now ceases. A variation of the North Carolina system was adopted, and the Constitutions of 1796, 1834, and 1870, are but chapters in the further institutional development under slowly changing conditions. It is tempting, in such a historical study, to note the antiquated remnants still crusted over modern procedure and conditions, as in the survival with wide powers of the remarkable County Court system in Tennessee. To indicate the lines of reform needed was inevitable in such a method, though possibly the intense convictions of a long-suffering citizen crop out in the argumentative advocacy of a particular system rather than in

the quiet exposition and the sharp differentiation of what is antiquated and old-fashioned from what is transient and superseded, or serviceable and permanent. That Mr. Caldwell feels that a new constitutional convention is imperatively demanded by the present needs of Tennessee follows naturally.

The volume is necessarily imperfect in details through the compression incident to a book brought within its compass, and these are yet to be worked in as the author intends. But enough has been said to show clearly the lines of growth and development, and thereby to justify not only the existence but the necessity of just such a book.

Too much space has already been taken to admit of any adequate discussion of the remaining monographs and pamphlets. The volume of Mr. Sanford, while "an historical address", it need hardly be said, was not delivered as it now appears, nor was it based solely upon preceding work. It constitutes in itself a detailed investigation, published after Dr. Merriam's work, and bringing out many facts and bearings entirely new and unknown. Much that has been hitherto merely touched upon is here traced to its ultimate sources — all the acts, bills, and records, which concern the history of the one institution and the aid by the State to the higher education of its youth in general. It was not an effort at glorification, like those usually indulged in on similar occasions, but a conscientious and arduous search into the relations between the State University and its mother, told with all the care and grace and distinction of the man of education and culture. It makes distinctly dismal reading here and there. The State has never given to the University any direct appropriation of its own, even for building and housing purposes; and in acting as trustee of grants from the national government has not been always discreet in its management of funds nor generous toward its children.

The investigation verified, all too pathetically, the points to which exception was taken with regard to the Bureau of Education Circular, as it originally appeared. Particularly

in the investigation of the "controversy between the United States, Tennessee, and North Carolina, as to the ownership of vacant lands in Tennessee and the right to perfect titles therein, with special reference to the Congressional Cession Act of 1806"; in that of the "legislation and treaties of North Carolina, the United States, and the Franklin government, relating to the Indian boundary line in the territory embraced in the Cherokee 'reservation' of 1783"; in the "note as to Tennessee enactments, from 1799 to 1805, inclusive, in reference to the occupant claims south of the French Broad and Holston"; and in the discussion of the significance of each charter, enactment, and bill, proposed and executed,—Mr. Sanford has established his claim to being both an accurate lawyer and a faithful historian. All his university culture and legal training have come to his assistance, and have cleared and pointed the way to original work for Tennesseans along paths almost as untrodden and untraversed as the original dense forests of their State.

The history of higher education in Tennessee was prepared for the National Bureau of Education by Lucius S. Merriam, of Chattanooga, a former student both of the University of Tennessee and of Vanderbilt. He declined a position at Vanderbilt, his *alma mater*, in order to finish his course of graduate study. Upon taking his Doctor's degree at the Johns Hopkins University in June, 1893, where he had been Fellow in Political Economy, there was some prospect of his State's reclaiming him, and his name was mentioned in connection with a chair of History and Economics in the State University; but sufficient means not being at the time forthcoming, the matter was necessarily dropped, and he was lost to the State forever. He became instructor in Political Economy in Cornell University in the autumn of 1893, and his sad death in November of the same year, by drowning in Lake Seneca, together with his companion, a South Carolina lady who was a law student, is well known. He lived barely long enough to see his monograph on Higher Education in Tennessee published, and to read

the outcry called forth by his criticism of the State's policy. The result was, when the objections were made, the excision of the objectionable statements,—conclusions that the author had felt to be true, though perhaps they were harshly and unfortunately expressed. After his death, his preceptor at the Johns Hopkins, Dr. Herbert B. Adams, who is the editor of this series of studies, prepared a slight biographical sketch, which is now prefixed to the volume.

The educational history of Tennessee could alone furnish abundant material for an extended review. It can merely be hinted at now, without entering into any of the controversies to which it naturally gives rise. What impresses one most in looking over these pages,—the tremendous lack of system and the utter independence of each aggregation of atoms of educational force—is doubtless, again, due to what Mr. Caldwell would call the “democratic tendency” everywhere manifest in Tennessee conditions. The most striking circumstance in the several chapters is the coincidence that one and the same State should chance to contain within its boundaries such different institutions with a peculiar status. The old University of Nashville,—developed from Davidson Academy, and converted into a college upon the gift of lands ceded by the national to the State government—has become the chief recipient of the Peabody Fund, is especially devoted to normal college work and the discipline of teachers, and is considered the prospective heir to the bulk of the large Peabody fortune. The University of Tennessee at Knoxville, was founded in 1794, the same year the first Territorial Assembly met at Knoxville, and was named Blount College, after William Blount, then Territorial Governor, and under the Constitution one of the first United States Senators from Tennessee. It has been honored with a large number of public men on its Board of Trustees, and first became officially connected with the State in 1807, by the same national grant of lands which was shared with Davidson Academy. Through the remarkably judicious management of its funds, this institution

has developed into the present State University, exercising full functions, and recognized in every way, except in coöperation and aid from a direct legislative appropriation. Vanderbilt University in Nashville,—the chief university of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, with all its bishops as *ex-officio* trustees,—was located centrally at Nashville, mainly through the efforts of the late Bishop McTyeire, and constitutes the crown of the institutions of that denomination, offering professional and graduate instruction, as well as undergraduate work. Similarly, Cumberland University at Lebanon is the leading educational institution of another denomination, the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, and possesses academic, law, and theological courses. Again, the University of the South was planned and placed at Sewanee, on the Cumberland Plateau, primarily through the interest and efforts of Bishop Otey, of Tennessee, and the Rev. Leonidas Polk, afterwards Bishop of Louisiana, but originally residing in Tennessee and rector of St. Peter's Church, Columbia. This University is under the joint control of the several Southern dioceses of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and the respective bishops are *ex-officio* members of its Board. The location was chosen, like that of Vanderbilt, for its generally central location for all the Southern States.

The central position of Tennessee among the Southern States has not only led it to be thus chosen for the site of the leading universities of these great religious bodies, but probably, in part, accounts for the presence within its borders of a larger number of colleges for the negro race than any other State possesses—possibly too many for the healthiest conditions of competition and for the best results. Fisk University at Nashville is the oldest of these. Doubtless, too, the peculiar prominence of the position of Tennessee in the late war, as the site of numerous battle-grounds and the fact of its division between Union and Confederate, have contributed largely to this selection.

The unfortunate sections into which the State has been

divided, and which have been perpetuated in the Constitution itself, are still traceable in the two Baptist institutions, one at each extreme of the State; the Southwestern Baptist University at Jackson, which superseded the West Tennessee College, founded upon the cession of certain lands by the national to the State government; and Carson and Newman College at Mossy Creek. Similarly the Presbyterians have the Southwestern Presbyterian University at Clarksville, and King College on the Virginia border at Bristol. Also, Hiwassee College is a Southern Methodist institution in East Tennessee.

The division of the churches into North and South, occasioned by the question of slavery, is also very marked. Old Washington College, Greenville and Tusculum College (now united), and Maryville College, are Northern Presbyterian institutions—in contrast with the two Southern Presbyterian mentioned above. The U. S. Grant University, with branches both at Athens and at Chattanooga, is the property of the Northern branch of the Methodist Church.

There are likewise other principles involved in founding additional institutions. There are the American Temperance University at Harriman (probably unique in the history of the country in its declared principles), and a host of Normal Colleges and special institutions claiming some particular mark and distinguishing feature. Truly, the spirit of education abroad in the State is “democratic”! The number of colleges in Tennessee, it has been declared, is exceeded by that of no other State in the Union except Ohio, where the condition has long been such that a member of a recent legislature is reported to have desired a commission to be appointed to determine *what was* a college and what a university! In the words of Mr. Sanford (p. 63): “It has come to pass in Tennessee, as has been said, that of ‘the making of colleges there is no end,’ and that nearly ‘every cross roads hamlet has, not its academy or high school, but its college,’ of which, by the way, the denominational colleges have attained, generally, no little

excellence. And now, to-day, we have in prospect colleges where our sons are to be educated, not only to be good denominationalists, but good Prohibitionists, or good Free Masons, or good Odd Fellows, or the like."

The status of the public school system — what is done well in some of the cities and larger towns by means of added local taxation and personal attention, and what is done indifferently and poorly or left undone altogether in many less fortunate or less populated localities — is one of the many lessons to be learned from the miscellaneous reports furnished to and published by the State Superintendent of Education from year to year. These results, again, must be regarded not so much as the products of the State aid as the achievements through communal activity.

Dr. Merriam naturally received in his work the assistance of those most interested. The account of the University of Nashville, for example, was based upon material provided by that well-known antiquarian and gatherer and preserver of historical records pertaining to his native city and State, Dr. J. Berrien Lindsley, of Nashville, the honored son of an honored father. The article on Vanderbilt shows the impress of the thought and care of Dr. W. M. Baskervill, of that institution—himself, by the way, a loyal native Tennessean. The account of the University of Tennessee, limiting itself in large measure to the statistical facts and changes in its policy, is from the pen of another native Tennessean, Professor Thomas C. Karns. Through an intimate acquaintance with all parts of the State and with its people, Professor Karns is fast becoming an authority on many Tennessee subjects. Besides this history of his *alma mater*, he has rewritten the article on Tennessee in Johnson's *New Cyclopædia*, and he is now looking over the proof sheets of a volume on civics, in a pedagogical series, pertaining to this State.

There is just space left to refer to the appearance, in Nashville within the past year, of the *American Historical Magazine*. At last the State has recognized the ne-

cessity and duty of promoting the investigation of its own history. Professor W. R. Garrett, the gentleman into whose hands this work has fallen, is well known in the State, and has entered upon his position with all the energy his opportunities permit. It seems to me that it is to be regretted that the name of the new venture is so broad and so confusingly like the newly-founded *American Historical Review*, a quarterly journal, published through the coöperation of American college professors and historians. This similarity of names leads to a natural confusion without any compensating advantages. The purposes and achievements of the Tennessee periodical, based upon its present foundation, and for its greatest usefulness, must and ought to be too purely of a local character to justify a national appellation. Indeed, there are many who have wished for a long time that such a venture might be fostered by State aid, as it deserves to be, and associated most intimately with the State Historical Society as a State periodical. This would lead to a renewed activity and a consequent large increase in the society's membership and usefulness. The Virginia Historical Society is thus active in the South, though without State aid, and the Massachusetts and Wisconsin societies are models for the East and West.

But if there were practical difficulties in the way of this, the best work which this new historical magazine could do would be to publish hitherto unpublished and inaccessible material in the State archives. The raw material of history, and the inspiration of the writing of history, must be sought after — and matters of present contest and discussion, alas! the general conception of what history is or ought to be, be relegated to where, if anywhere, it belongs — the daily newspaper.

There are yet other channels of inspiration open in the outlook for Tennessee history by Tennesseans. There is the inspiration given to students trained at our best institutions. There are essays and monographs, bachelor,

master, and doctor theses, encouraged and prepared under the direction of the respective professors in charge: Dr. F. W. Moore at Vanderbilt, Col. W. R. Garrett at the Peabody Normal, Professor Trent at Sewanee, and Professors T. C. Karns and Charles W. Turner at the University of Tennessee. Two bachelor theses of the last-named institution at the recent commencement, while perhaps not producing unknown results, yet exemplified and taught clearly the methods of independent opinion and research. The work of clubs in different parts of the State, as, for example, the papers and discussions of the Irving Club, of Knoxville, often lead to permanent results. The existence of patriotic societies, while primarily and necessarily social, and with a deplorable tendency towards excessive rhetoric in their commemorative addresses, nevertheless, promotes the same end. The formation of university extension centres in the cities and larger towns, like the efforts made in Knoxville by local and by imported talent, promotes the interest. Tennessee graduates pursuing advanced post-graduate courses in distant universities may multiply this production. Dr. Merriam received the impulse for his work at the Johns Hopkins, and a Tennessee student at the University of Chicago, for example, is undertaking the investigation of other material relating to Tennessee history. Graduates of Tennessee universities are working in other States. Both Sewanee and Vanderbilt have their representatives. Dr. William I. Thomas at Oberlin College, Ohio, and at the University of Chicago, and Mr. Thaddeus Thomas in Baltimore, author of the paper on "The Public School System of Tennessee" in the government volume, are both former students of the State University.

It is good to be at the end of a century. Let educated men look forward earnestly to the achievements of the new!

J. B. HENNEMAN.

The University of Tennessee.